



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,499	04/21/2004	Tomohide Ishigami	ISHIGAMI I	4306

1444 7590 01/22/2007
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
624 NINTH STREET, NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER

RAO, ANAND SHASHIKANT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/828,499

Applicant(s)

ISHIGAMI ET AL.

Examiner

Andy S. Rao

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/10/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-23 as filed on 11/18/07 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 11-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff.

Paff discloses a surveillance system (Paff: figure 6) comprising: a plurality of cameras (Paff: column 3, lines 35-45); intruding object recognizing means for identifying a coordinate information of an object of monitoring on a coordinate space by analyzing image signals entered from said cameras (Paff: column 7, lines 50-60); camera function determining means for allocating (Paff: column 4, lines 15-25), according to the coordinate information of an object of monitoring on a coordinate space, to a first camera said tracking/shooting function whose field of view is a predetermined direction of said object of monitoring (Paff: column 4, lines 25-35) and to a second camera a wide angle shooting function (Paff: column 8, lines 5-15); and camera control means for controlling said plurality of cameras according to the allocation of functions by the camera function determining means (Paff: column 6, lines 35-45), as in claim 1. However, Paff only discloses one rotating camera which is configured to perform a tracking/shooting

Art Unit: 2621

function and a wide angle shooting function as in the claim (Paff: column 8, lines 5-10), where as the claims require at least two such cameras. However, this limitation is merely a simple duplication of parts for a multiplied effect (i.e. the replication of master cameras), and such a modification would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in order to monitor a wider area with tracking features, and thus is unpatentable as has been established by law, St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., Inc., 193 USPQ 8, 11, (7th Cir. 1977). The Paff system, as modified to incorporate an additional master camera, has all of the features of claim 11.

Regarding claim 12, the Paff system, as modified to incorporate an additional master camera, discloses that the system further provided with image accumulating means for accumulating images of the object of monitoring in advance and image recognizing means for comparing said accumulated images of the object of monitoring with an image of the object of monitoring entered from the first camera (Paff: column 5, lines 1-24), wherein the camera function determining means allocate to a third camera a tracking function according to a result of comparison by said image recognizing means and a situation of the object of monitoring (Paff: column 6, lines 55-65), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 13, the Paff system, as modified to incorporate an additional master camera, discloses wherein the camera function determining means choose a camera whose field of view is in the predetermined direction of the object of monitoring, and allocate a tracking/shooting function to the cameras in a preferential order with priority camera nearest said object of monitoring (Paff: column 4, lines 40-51), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 4-5, the Paff system, as modified to incorporate an additional master camera, discloses that the camera function determining means chooses a camera whose field of

Art Unit: 2621

view is in the predetermined direction of the object of monitoring, and allocate the tracking/shooting function to the cameras in a preferential order with priority assigned to a camera farthest from said object of monitoring (Paff: column 4, lines 50-67; column 5, lines 1-20), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 16, the Paff system, as modified to incorporate an additional master camera, discloses wherein the camera function determining means memorize states of the multi-camera, and allocate the tracking/shooting function or the wide angle shooting function to said multi-camera according to the states of said multi-camera and the situation of the object of monitoring (Paff: column 3, lines 40-50), as in the claim.

Regarding claim 17, the Paff system, as modified to incorporate an additional master camera, discloses wherein the camera function determining means, when any camera is added or removed or any camera is in trouble, update memorized states of the multi-camera is performed (Paff: column 4, lines 40-50), as in the claim.

Regarding claims 18- 22, the Paff system, as modified to incorporate an additional master camera, discloses wherein the camera function determining means memorize a state of a monitored area, and allocate the tracking/shooting function or the wide angle shooting function to the cameras according to the state of said monitored area and the situation of the object of monitoring (Paff: column 5, lines 5-35), as in the claims.

Regarding claim 23, the Paff system, as modified to incorporate an additional master camera, discloses wherein the image accumulating means hold in advance facial image data picked up in many different directions, and the image recognizing means compare said facial

Art Unit: 2621

image data with a facial image of the object of monitoring entered from any camera (Paff: column 4, lines 1-5), as in the claim.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy S. Rao whose telephone number is (571)-272-7337. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571)-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andy S. Rao
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2621

asr

January 16, 2007

ANDY RAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

